UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JUAN PABLO CHAVEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

SERGEANT WILLIAM FINNEY, OFFICER STEPHEN STREICHER, and OFFICER ANTHONY TORTORICE,

Defendants.

USDC-SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED

**DATE FILED:** 04/12/2022

No. 19-CV-4109 (RA)

ORDER

RONNIE ABRAMS, United States District Judge:

On March 23, 2022, the Court issued an Opinion and Order granting in part and denying in part Defendants' motion for summary judgment. The Court is in receipt of the attached letter from Plaintiff, in which he expresses his intention to file a Rule 60(b) motion in response to the Court's ruling.

Because Rule 60(b) is not a proper vehicle to challenge a ruling granting in part and denying in part summary judgment, *see Blond v. Leonard*, 277 F. Supp. 3d 420, 423 (W.D.N.Y. 2017), the Court construes Plaintiff's letter as expressing an intention to file a motion for reconsideration. If Plaintiff agrees with this construction, he shall file a motion for reconsideration by May 13, 2022. Any such motion should set forth the basis for Plaintiff's belief that the March 23 Order should be reconsidered because of "controlling decisions of data that the [C]ourt overlooked," *Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995), "an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice." *Virgin Atl. Airways, Ltd. v. Nat'l Mediation Bd.*, 956 F.2d 1245, 1255 (2d Cir. 1992).

Case 1:19-cv-04109-RA Document 72 Filed 04/12/22 Page 2 of 4

If Plaintiff does not agree that his motion is best understood as a motion for reconsideration,

he shall submit a letter by May 13 setting forth the basis for his belief that another procedural

vehicle governs his request. Specifically, the Court notes the possibility that Plaintiff may be

seeking to appeal the Court's March 23 ruling to the Second Circuit—either in addition to a motion

for reconsideration or in the alternative to a motion for reconsideration. Because the March 23

Order was not a final order, however, it is only appealable if the Court certifies an interlocutory

appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). If Plaintiff intends to move for certification of an

interlocutory appeal, he shall explain in his May 13 letter why the March 23 Order "involves a

controlling question of law . . . as to which there is a substantial ground for difference of opinion,"

and why an immediate appeal from the March 23 Order "may materially advance the altaite

termination of the litigation." Capitol Recs., LLC v. Vimeo, LLC, 972 F. Supp. 2d 537, 551

(S.D.N.Y. 2013).

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at the

California address listed below and to add this California address to the docket for future

communications with Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 12, 2022

New York, New York

Hon. Ronnie Abrams

United States District Judge

## **SERVICE ADDRESS:**

Juan Pablo Chavez 106 ½ Judge John Aiso Street, # 722 Los Angeles, CA 90012

U.S.D.C. for the S.D.N.Y Chaver V. Finney 19-cu- 4109 /RE Motion for Ext. of Time to file 59/e On Notice of Appeal to the 22 cis w/ Petition ofor writ of cert before Judgement Hello you Honor, Blessings ; peace to you and your loved ones Thank you for all that you do. I receipted your March 23, 2012 Spinion & Order by surprise yesterdayish when I Gogled the case. I am willfully being held to a roach innundation at a public place of accomedation with know furnishing The Gasetext webpage lacks some of the nuance 10 and essence the original letter, paper, has. I will file a rule (60(6) within a 'teasonable time! But, would like to first give this court jurisdiction by to alter amend? May I please have 28 days from when I receive the letter? I spent my safety net, ssi, Keeping the bugs at bay, so it will be some time 18 before my mail forwarding funds are available. and insurance Please resend here and remove the East N.Y. directions? Thank you again god bless. Sincerely, 1. 2:21-CV-09550 (FMO)(JC) 0.0.CA 106 1/2 Judge John Asso St. one take - improve righting = 34 minutes start and por - 4:27 AM PST = 34 minutes # 122 L.A., CA. 90012